



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,028	12/30/2003	Brian R. Meyers	MS304770.01 / MSFTP501US	9173
27195 7590 05/21/2009 TUROCY & WATSON, LLP 127 Public Square 57th Floor, Key Tower CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
EXAMINER SHIN, KYUNG H				
ART UNIT 2443		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/21/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,028

Applicant(s)

MEYERS ET AL.

Examiner

Kyung Hye Shin

Art Unit

2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26 - 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26 - 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application amendments filed on 2-27-2009. Claims 1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26 - 32 are pending. Claims 1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26, 28 - 32 have been amended. Claims 4, 6 - 10, 12, 20 - 25, 33 - 40 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 13, 26, 32 are independent. This application was filed on 12-30-2003.
2. The 112 rejection has been withdrawn due to claim amendments.
3. The 101 rejection has been withdrawn due to claim amendments.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot based on new grounds of rejection.

Specification Objection

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claims 1, 13, 26 are objected as "computer readable storage medium" is not defined clearly in the specification, so that the meaning of the term in the claims is not ascertainable by reference to the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1 - 3, 5, 13 - 18, 26, 28 - 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Paroz** (US Patent No. **6,587,125**) in view of **Beged-Dov et al.** (US Patent No. **6,983,328**) and further in view of **Brewer et al.** (US Patent No. **5,786,818**)

Regarding Claim 1, Paroz discloses a system embodied on a computer readable storage medium that facilitates controlling a computing device, comprising a local agent component that receives local input device data from one or more local input devices of a local system and routes the local input device data to a remote system for the control thereof with the one or more local input devices. (Paroz col 5, ll 30-35: software (mediation) components; sends updated information about the state of first computing device (remote) to second computing device (local); col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input from said mediation system (communicates with local) and executes it on first computing device (remote); control first computing device (remote) from second computing device (local); col 5, ll 17-23: remotely controlling a first computing device from a second computing device; local (second) system controls remote (first) system; col 7, ll 5-11: components of present invention, local server, mediator program)

Paroz does not explicitly disclose a switching location and local system to remote system clipboard transmissions.

However, Brewer discloses a switching location on a user interface, wherein locating a user interface pointer within the switching location signals to switch the local input data to the remote system. (Brewer col 2, ll 35-37: position data or location used to set

focus; col 4, l 66 - col 5, l 21: eliminate need to click to establish "focus" or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window)

Focus is a situation where a window is placed into the foreground or currently given control of console and responds to commands from mouse or keyboard. (Brewer col 1, 62-65) Switching location is equivalent to a window being given control of commands within computing environment.

And, Beged-Dov discloses wherein the local agent component transmits content from a local clipboard at the local system to the remote system upon detecting that the content has been copied to the local clipboard. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958) (Appellant argued that claims to a permanent mold casting apparatus for molding trunk pistons were allowable over the prior art because the claimed invention combined "old permanent-mold structures together with a timer and solenoid which automatically actuates the known pressure valve system to release the inner core after a predetermined time has elapsed." The court held that broadly providing an automatic or mechanical means to replace a manual activity which accomplished the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art.).

Detecting the clipboard data is the same whether manual or automatic.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz to a switching location as taught by Brewer, and to modify Paroz-Brewer for local system to remote system clipboard transmissions as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Brewer for a convenient method to bring a background window to the foreground in mouse

manipulation procedures such as drag and drop (Brewer col 6, ll 17-31), and to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6).

Regarding Claim 2, Paroz discloses the system of claim 1, the local agent component further receives a signal from the remote system to cease routing the local input device data to the remote system, the signal triggered by locating a second user interface pointer at the remote system within a second switching location on a user interface of the remote system. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose triggering switching location by position.

However, Brewer discloses wherein triggered by locating a second user interface pointer at the remote system within a second switching location on a user interface of the remote system. (Brewer col 2, ll 35-37: position data or location used to set focus; col 4, l 66 - col 5, l 21: eliminate need to click to establish "focus" or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window, position of mouse in remote system window switches focus or control)

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Brewer is stated in Claim 1 above.

Regarding Claim 3, Paroz discloses the system of claim 1, the local input device data is used by the remote system along with remote input device data of one or more

remote input devices to facilitate control of the remote system, using at least one of the one or more local input devices, the one or more remote input devices, or a combination of one or more of the local and remote input devices. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local); col 5, ll 30-35: sends updated information about the state of first computing device to equivalent or second computing device)

Regarding Claim 5, Paroz discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising a remote agent component of the remote system in communication with the local agent component to facilitate control of the remote system through the remote agent component, the remote agent component signals the local agent component to disengage control of the remote system *via* the one or more local input devices by routing the local input device data for processing only by the local system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events; determine whether to generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local); col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Regarding Claim 13, Paroz discloses a system that facilitates control of a second computing system with a first computing system, comprising:

a first agent programmed on the first computing system that receives local input device data from a local input device; (Paroz col 5, ll 30-35: mediation system

(communicates with local agent); receives control input from second computing system (first agent))

Furthermore, Paroz discloses a second agent of the second computing system that communicates with the first agent to facilitate control of the second computing system, the local input device triggers routing of the local input device data by the first computer executable agent to the second computer executable agent.

(Paroz col 4, ll 61-65: software component on first computing device (second agent) monitors input events from second computing device (first agent); col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))

Paroz does not explicitly disclose a location associated with switching.

However, Brewer discloses wherein trigger is based on a location of a pointer associated with a user interface. (Brewer col 2, ll 35-37: position data or location used to set focus; col 4, l 66 - col 5, l 21: eliminate need to click to establish "focus" or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window)

And, Beged-Dov discloses wherein the first agent transmits clipboard information copied from the first computing system to the second agent to facilitate sharing of clipboard data between the first and second systems. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49:

past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Brewer is stated in Claim 1 above.

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Beged-Dov is stated in Claim 1 above.

Regarding Claim 14, Paroz discloses the system of claim 13, wherein locating the pointer to coincide with an area location within the user interface triggers the first agent to route the input device data to the second computing system. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))

Paroz does not explicitly disclose a switching area. However, Brewer discloses a switching area. (Brewer col 2, ll 35-37: position data or location used to set focus; col 4, l 66 - col 5, l 21: eliminate need to click to establish “focus” or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window)
Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Brewer is stated in Claim 1 above.

Regarding Claim 15, Paroz discloses the system of claim 14, the switching area location is determined manually by a user who configures the physical orientation of the second computing system with respect to the first computing system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events (mouse clicks, window focus); determine whether to generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local);

col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Paroz does not explicitly disclose a switching area.

However, Brewer discloses wherein a first switching area location is determined on a user interface of the first computing system and second switching area is determined on a display of the second computing system. (Brewer col 2, ll 35-37: position data or location used to set focus; col 4, l 66 - col 5, l 21: eliminate need to click to establish "focus" or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window)

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Brewer is stated in Claim 1 above.

Regarding Claim 16, Paroz discloses the system of claim 14, a first and second computing system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events (mouse clicks, window focus); determine whether to generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local); col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Paroz does not explicitly disclose a switching area.

However, Brewer discloses wherein the switching area is determined automatically by the physical orientation of the second system with respect to first system, first agent determines placement of switching area on a user interface of first system based on determined physical orientation. (Brewer col 2, ll 35-37: position data or location used

to set focus; col 4, I 66 - col 5, I 21: eliminate need to click to establish "focus" or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window)

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Brewer is stated in Claim 1 above.

Regarding Claim 17, Paroz discloses the system of claim 13, the first agent routes the local input device data based upon location of a pointer associated with a remote input device of the second computing system. (Paroz col 5, II 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, II 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, II 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote); window in foreground is control window)

Paroz does not explicitly disclose a switching area.

However, Brewer discloses wherein pointer location matching a location of a display element of the second system triggering the second agent to signal the first agent to route the input data to the first local system only. (Brewer col 2, II 35-37: position data or location used to set focus; col 4, I 66 - col 5, I 21: eliminate need to click to establish "focus" or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window)

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Brewer is stated in Claim 1 above.

Regarding Claim 18, Paroz discloses the system of claim 13, the first agent facilitates copying data from the first computing system to the second computing system. (Paroz

col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local); col 5, ll 30-35: sends updated information about the state of first computing device to equivalent or second computing device)

Paroz does not explicitly disclose copying of clipboard between systems. However, Beged-Dov discloses copying of clipboard data from the first system to second system by encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data, verifies that the clipboard data can be copied to the second computing system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Beged-Dov is stated in Claim 1 above.

Regarding Claim 26, Paroz discloses a method for controlling a computer, the method comprising:

- a) employing a processor executing computer-executable instructions stored on a computer-readable storage medium to implement the following acts: (Paroz col 7, ll 42-46: second computing system (local) can be a personal computer; implies a processor for system operations; col 7, ll 5-11: components of present invention, local server, mediator program)
- b) receiving input device data and associated with a first agent of a first computing system, programmed to receive and switch the at least one of input device data;

(Paroz col 4, ll 56-60: software component (first agent) on first computing device monitors events from the first computing device)

Paroz does not disclose a switching location.

However, Brewer discloses

- c) designating at least one switching location within a user interface of the first computing system; d) determining when a location of a pointer associated with the user interface coincides with the at least one switching location; e) routing the input device data to a second computing system based upon the input device data upon determining that the location of the pointer coincides with the at least one switching location. (Brewer col 2, ll 35-37: position data or location used to set focus; col 4, l 66 - col 5, l 21: eliminate need to click to establish "focus" or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window)

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Brewer is stated in Claim 1 above.

Paroz does not explicitly disclose receiving clipboard data.

However, Beged-Dov discloses:

- f) determining that content at the first system has been copied to a local clipboard; g) transmitting the content from the local clipboard to a remote clipboard at the second system upon detecting that the content has been copied to the local clipboard. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4,

I 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Beged-Dov is stated in Claim 1 above.

Detecting the clipboard data is the same whether manual or automatic.

Regarding Claim 28, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising tracking a location of the second computing system such that placement of the second computing system within a working area to the first computing system causes the first agent to automatically facilitate control of the second system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events (mouse clicks, window focus); determine whether to generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local); col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Specification page 13 discloses within working area sets up a network connection between the two systems. Once connected the two systems operate as a first system controlling a second system.

Regarding Claim 29, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising designating the first computing system to trigger routing of the input device data to second system, the one or more locations on user interface include at least one of a display element and an icon. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote); col 7, ll 1-4: analyze first computing device's user interface (GUI, display, icons); creates

a equivalent second user interface and sends second user interface to second computing device; col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Paroz does not explicitly disclose a switching area or location.

However, Brewer discloses one or more switching locations on a display screen wherein placement of a user interface pointer associated with the first monitoring device within the switching location instructs the first agent to route the input device data to the second computing system. (Brewer col 2, ll 35-37: position data or location used to set focus; col 4, l 66 - col 5, l 21: eliminate need to click to establish "focus" or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window) Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Brewer is stated in Claim 1 above.

Regarding Claim 30, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose the routing of the clipboard data to a second system. However, Beged-Dov discloses wherein routing of the clipboard data includes encapsulating clipboard data and transmitting encapsulated clipboard data to the second system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Beged-Dov is stated in Claim 1 above.

Regarding Claim 31, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose authenticating second system before transmitting clipboard data. However, Beged-Dov discloses wherein authenticating the second system before transmitting clipboard data, and authentication and transmitting are performed one of automatically or manually. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: paste function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Beged-Dov is stated in Claim 1 above.

7. Claims **11, 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paroz**-“**Beged-Dov**”-**Brewer** and further in view of **Deshpande** (US Patent No. **7,171,444**).

Regarding Claim 11, Paroz discloses the system of claim 1 the local agent component facilitates an interface on the local system to control the remote system. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local); col 5, ll 37-40: visual status monitoring system (display, user interface) detects changes in the status of first computing system (remote) and transfers those changes to second computing device (local))

Paroz does not explicitly disclose a touch pad interface. However, Deshpande

discloses emulation of a touch pad interface. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz for a touch pad interface as taught by Deshpande. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47)

Regarding Claim 27, Paroz discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising a display of the first computing system to facilitate control of the second computing system. (Paroz col 5, ll 37-40: visual status monitoring (display); detects changes in state of first computing device (second computing system) and sends those changes for transfer to second computing device (first computing device)) Paroz does not explicitly disclose a touch pad. However, Deshpande discloses a touch pad. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz to use a touch pad as taught by Deshpande. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande in order to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47)

8. Claims 19, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paroz-“Beged-Dov”-Brewer** and further in view of **Kawamura et al.** (US Patent No. 6,662,207).

Regarding Claim 19, Paroz discloses the system of claim 13, the first agent of a first computing system and a second computing system such that deployment of the second system within a working area of the first system automatically facilitates control of the second system by the user via the first system. (Paroz col 9, ll 39-44: visual status monitor monitors GUI events (mouse clicks, window focus); determine whether to generate a message to the mediator for the second computing device (local); col 9, ll 21-25: handlers for events received from local program; handlers for events occurring on second computing device)

Specification page 13 discloses within working area sets up a network connection between the two systems. Once connected the two systems operate as a first system controlling a second system.

Paroz does not explicitly disclose coupled to an associations database.

However, Kawamura discloses wherein coupled to database of associations between a user, first and second systems. (Kawamura col 6, l 65 - col 7, l 6: information stored in agent profile (agent attributes); information with regard to whether individual platforms are capable of accepting and activating an agent; col 32, ll 23-31: storage of platform profile and agent profile; can be stored in a centralized or distributed manner (agent profile for each agent is part of each agent or in a central store))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Paroz where coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between users and systems as taught by Kawamura. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Kawamura to perform highly efficient

information processing that is responsive to changes in situation. (see Kawamura col 6, ll 36-43)

Regarding Claim 32, Paroz discloses a system embodied on a computer-readable storage medium that facilitates controlling a computing system, comprising:

- a) means for providing an agent for a first system, which agent receives input device data of one or more input devices of the first system; (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input)
- d) means for signaling the agent to route the input device data to at least a second system; (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: second (local) system controls first (remote) system; col 5, ll 30-35: mediator (local agent) receives control input; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))
- d) means for routing the input device data to the second system for processing; (Paroz col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))
- e) means for presenting objects displayed by the second system, on a display of the first system; (Paroz col 7, ll 16-23: monitors the user interface output from the local program and sends appropriate output to the remote computing device)
- f) means for controlling the second system via the display of the first system. (Paroz col 7, ll 16-23: monitors the user interface output from the local program

and sends appropriate output to the remote computing device)

Paroz discloses a user thereof to automatically facilitate control of the second system via the first system. (Paroz col 5, ll 17-23: a system for controlling a first computing device (remote) from a second computing device (local); col 5, ll 30-35: sends updated information about the state of first computing device to equivalent or second computing device; col 5, ll 41-45: receives control input and executes (routes) on first computing device (remote))

Paroz does not explicitly disclose an associations database comprising associations information between users and local and remote systems.

However, Kawamura discloses:

b) means for accessing a database of associations between the first system, at least a second system; (Kawamura col 6, l 65 - col 7, l 6: information stored in agent profile (agent attributes); information with regard to whether individual platforms are capable of accepting and activating an agent; col 32, ll 23-31: storage of platform profile and agent profile; can be stored in a centralized or distributed manner (agent profile for each agent is part of each agent or in a central store))

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Kawamura is stated in Claim 19 above.

Paroz does not explicitly disclose a switching location.

However, Brewer discloses

c) wherein means for determining that a pointer associated with a user interface of

the first system has been located to a designated switching location within the user interface; means for signaling the agent to route the input device data to the at least a second system upon determining that the pointer has been located to the designated switching location. (Brewer col 2, ll 35-37: position data or location used to set focus; col 4, l 66 - col 5, l 21: eliminate need to click to establish "focus" or control, place cursor on exposed portion of a background window to change focus to that window)

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Brewer is stated in Claim 1 above.

Paroz does not explicitly disclose local system to remote system clipboard transmissions. However, Beged-Dov discloses:

- g) means for automatically routing clipboard content from first system to remote clipboard at second system, the second system including a second agent that verifies that the clipboard content can be received at the second system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

Motivation to modify Paroz as taught by Beged-Dov is stated in Claim 1 above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyung Hye Shin whose telephone number is (571)272-3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia L. Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyung Hye Shin
Examiner
Art Unit 2443

KHS
May 18, 2009

/J Bret Dennison/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443